

REMARKS

Claim 1, 3, 4, and 10 remain in the application and claims 1, and 10 have been amended hereby. Claims 5 and 7 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1, 3-5, 7, and 10 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Reeder in view of Grundy and Oshima et al.

A feature of the present invention is to provide a display in a user terminal having a graphical-unit-interface for enabling a user to select between free access to a software program and paid access to a software program including a selected one of a plurality of supplemental pay functions. See Fig. 6 of the present application, for example.

Independent claims 1 and 10 have been amended to recite these features of the present invention.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Reeder, Grundy, and Oshima et al. fails to show or suggest providing a display in a user terminal having a graphical-unit-interface for enabling a user to select between free access to a software program and paid access to a software program including a selected one of a plurality of supplemental pay functions.

The Office Action at page 4 concedes that Reeder is silent about enabling a user to access a software program for free and cites Grundy as curing this deficiency.

It is respectfully submitted that, although Grundy appears to teach a free use of an evaluation version of a software program and a paid use of a full-function software program,

Grundy fails to show or suggest providing a display in a user terminal having a graphical-unit-interface for enabling a user to select between free access to a software program and paid access to a software program including a selected one of a plurality of supplemental pay functions and, because there are no features in Oshima et al., being directed to a ciphering system, that somehow could be combined with Reeder and Grundy and result in the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 1 and 10, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentable distinct over Reeder in view of Grundy and Oshima et al.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Cooper & Dunham LLP



Jay H. Maioli
Reg. No. 27,213

JHM/PCF:pmc